



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,795	02/18/2004	Clas G. Sivertsen	60046.0049US11	2719

7590 09/29/2005

Merchant & Gould P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

GILMAN, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2833

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,795	SIVERTSEN, CLAS G.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alexander D. Gilman	2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Peterson et al.

With regard to claims 1 and 2, Peterson (US 6,160,728) disclose an apparatus comprising:

a housing;

a power input connector (terminating 10);

a power output connection (130) for delivery of power to the second powered device;

a power supply for converting AC to DC (220).

a power output cord (a cord attached to 140)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al in view of Chen et al.

Peterson et al disclose all of the limitations except for a switch on an external portion of the housing.

Chen et al (US 5,563,782) disclose (Fig 20) a switch on an external portion of the housing (20).

Art Unit: 2833

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Peterson et al with the switch, as taught by Chen et al, to safely operate the Peterson et al apparatus.

2. Claims 7-10, 15, 16, 20, 21, 27, 28, 33, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al in view of Faulk.

With regard to claims 7, 8, 20, and 21, 27, 28, 33, 34, Peterson et al disclose all of the limitations except for explicitly disclosing IEC-320 connectors.

Since the IEC -320 connector are standard for using voltages from 100 to 240 volts (Faulk, US 5,907,197; col. 1, lines 9-26) and Peterson et al suggest that their device is used for AC 120, 140 volts, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange Peterson et al with the IEC-320 connectors, as taught by Faulk, to operate the Peterson et al apparatus at the specified voltages .

With regard to claims 9, 10, 15, 16, 24, 30, Peterson et al disclose all of the limitations except for a cable assembly with a connector.

Faulk disclose a cable assembly (Fig. 2d) with a connector.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Peterson et al with the cable assembly, as taught by Faulk, to operate the second powered device.

3. Claims 11, 14, 23, 29, 13, 22, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al in view of Harada et al or Yang.

Peterson et al disclose all of the limitations except for a control circuit.

Harada et al (US 5,910,750) disclose a control circuit (Fig. 1b,).

Yang (US 6,664,758) discloses a control circuit (Fig. 3).

Art Unit: 2833

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Peterson et al with a control circuit, as taught by Harada et al or Yang, to disable the alternating connector when the functional circuit is not activated for safety reasons.

With regard to claims 13, 22, 35, Peterson -Harada et al disclose the claimed invention except for integral mounting the power cord to the housing. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was integrally mount the power cord to the housing, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 U.S. 164 (1893).

4. Claims 12, 17-19, 25, 26, 31, 32, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson et al in view of Harada et al and further in view of Voloshin.

Peterson et al- Harada et al disclose all of the limitations except for a connection structure to Make the second powered device operative to control the input signal.

Voloshin (US 5,961,619) disclose s a bus connector (Fig. 4, 5) to make the second powered device operative to control the input signal.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Peterson et al with a control circuit, as taught by Nagai et al, to make the respective connectors operative or non-operative

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Gilman whose telephone number is (703) 305-0847. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:30 a.m. - 8:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley can be reached on (703) 308-2319. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

Art Unit: 2833

10/17/2003

Alex Gilman
ALEXANDER GILMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER